

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action has been thoroughly considered. By way of the hereinabove amendments and the following remarks, Applicants believe their application to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended their specification on page 3, line 32 to provide greater clarity. Applicants note, however, that no new matter has been introduced by way this amendment.

Applicants have withdrawn Claim 3 from consideration without prejudice in view of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants have also made some clarifying amendments to Claim 2.

Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the cited Bell reference. Claim 1 has been amended to require "a plurality of fixed power supply units" and "each fixed power supply unit having a different fixed output power." Applicants advance that the Bell reference neither discloses nor suggest these new limitations.

In contrast, the Bell reference discloses in Figure 2 and column 6 lines 6 to 8, a single power supply (denoted 220 in Figure 2) connected to a switch 214. The embodiment illustrated in Figure 3 of the Bell reference also teaches a single switching power supply 332. The Bell reference accords with the prior art approach discussed on page 9 lines 1 to 4 having a maximum switching frequency of 1MHz.

Moreover, the present invention allows faster switching, with the advantage over another prior art approach, which uses a linear regulator of being more highly efficient. In this regard, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to page 9 lines 4 to 10 of the present application.

Rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the cited Bell reference. Applicants advance that Claim 7 requires "at least two selectable power supply units with different fixed output powers." However, Applicants contend that the Bell reference neither discloses nor suggests this recited feature in Claim 7.

In contrast, Applicants put forth that the Bell reference discloses, a single power supply denoted 220 in Figure 2 connected to a switch 214 in Figure 2 and column 6 lines 6 to 8. The Figure 3 embodiment also teaches a single switching power supply 332. The Bell reference accords with the prior art approach discussed on page 9 lines 1 to 4 of the present application having a maximum switching frequency of 1 MHz. The present invention, however, allows faster switching, with the advantage over another prior art approach, which uses a linear regulator of being more highly efficient. In this regard, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to page 9 lines 4 to 10 of the present application.

Other Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

With respect to the Examiner's rejections of dependent claims 2, 4, 6 and 10, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Applicants advance that these rejections fall away by logical extension given the hereinabove arguments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

With respect to the Examiner's rejections of dependent 8, 5 and 9, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicants advance that these rejections fall away by logical extension given the hereinabove arguments.

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the Examiner's Office Action. Thus, in view of the hereinabove remarks, Applicants respectfully request immediate reconsideration and allowance of their patent application and its claims. To that end, if the Examiner feels that a conference might expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Ozer M. N. Teitelbaum
Attorney for the Applicants
Reg. No. 36,698
(973) 386-8803

Date: 11/04/04

Lucent Technologies Inc.
Docket Administrator - Rm 3J-219
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733